

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/409,644

Applicant(s)

Lewis et al.

Examiner

Arlen Soderquist

Art Unit

1743



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arlen Soderquist(3) Joseph R. Baker, Jr.(2) Dr. Nathan Lewis

(4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 11, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: proposed changes to claims 98, 104-106, 108, 111, 115, 117, 126, 128, 134, 137, 142-143 and 15

Identification of prior art discussed:

all prior artAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed examiner's concern that the phrase "alternating regions" can be read in many ways that go beyond the compositionally different regions that are in contact with each other yet distinct and separate from each other which is disclosed in the specification. This was in terms of the materials in the applied references. In particular with the Gibson reference, discussed the copolymers and types blends that could be taught by Gibson. Discussed what constitutes a response of the sensor material to an analyte. Examiner submitted that, as proposed, the response of the sensor material does not affect the scope of the claim. Discussed the scope of the apparatus in communication with the electrical leads and the type of changes that are possible with the current language. Discussed the changes to the figures and reached an agreement relative to figures 1A and 1C. Examiner will consider the response when filed and contact applicant to inform applicant of the application status or suggest changes for consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

ARLEN SODERQUIST
PRIMARY EXAMINER


Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.